

go

Socialism VERSUS Bolshevism

By
JAMES ONEAL

1935

RAND SCHOOL PRESS
7 EAST 15th STREET
NEW YORK

PRICE 10 CENTS

Copyright, 1935
By The Rand School Press

200

Pamphlet Sales Build the Party

Ben Hanford, who was probably the greatest propaganda speaker the Socialist party ever had, used to say that the most important officer in a local or branch was the Literature Agent. The best of street speakers, he held, could do little more than rouse interest in Socialism. Unless his hearers carried home something to read, the impression he had made would soon fade out. Experience proves that he was right.

It is better to sell Socialist literature than to give it away. People are not likely to think that anything they get is worth more than it costs them. If they pay a nickel or a dime for a pamphlet they are pretty sure to read it, if only to see whether they have got their money's worth.

Besides being the most effective method of educational propaganda, the selling of literature costs the branch nothing and may even yield it a small but steady income. A couple of dollars provides a sufficient stock to start with. After that, it requires only energy, patience, and common sense to make the thing go and grow.

The Literature Agent who cannot sell an average of one pamphlet for every ten persons in the meeting has not yet learned the art. The way to learn is to keep on trying. The trouble with many branches is that they never really try.

SOCIALISM vs. BOLSHEVISM

SINCE the Bolsheviks rose to power in Russia in 1917 and organized the Communist International there has been an irrepressible conflict between the Socialist and Labor parties and trade unions of the world and the Communist movement, including its "splinter" offshoots and "innocents' clubs." There are some Socialists in the United States who believe that the only conflict between the two movements is Bolshevik support of armed insurrection and dictatorship. A few agree that support of armed risings should be condemned, but that other Bolshevik views may be permitted in the party, so long as the advocates accept the general party program. Otherwise, they say, we strike down party democracy.

First, as to this conception of party democracy. It would admit the Anarchists, Syndicalists, Communists of various shades, provided they do not *publicly* advocate armed insurrection.

It should be noted that this view of democracy has never been accepted by any of the schools of Anarchism or Communism, nor has it ever been advanced in the Socialist movement before. It is not democracy but the destruction of democratic procedure. It is not a requirement of democracy that an organization must provide publications, forums, and local units for persons holding widely different views. *Each organization requires as a first condition of its life and stability that its members agree on certain basic ideas.*

Within the range of fundamental ideas there is plenty of room for discussion, but if minds do not meet on basic ideas the party is torn to shreds. Does this mean we deny democracy to Anarchists, Syndicalists, Communists, etc.? Certainly not. They do not place their organization apparatus—local units, committeees, conferences, newspapers—at our disposal, and rightly so. Neither should we place ours at their disposal. What then is our duty to them? *It consists solely of defending their right to have their own organization—their own social units, committees, conferences and newspapers.*

That idea of party democracy which prohibits only public advocacy of armed insurrection and permits support of other ideas in fundamental conflict with Socialist philosophy is an absurdity.

THE SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

We may now turn to the Socialist philosophy of history and social evolution. For our purpose it is necessary to single out only one main aspect of this philosophy. Throughout all Socialist literature one fact is stressed—a Socialist society is impossible until capitalistic industry has reached a fairly high stage of development. Socialism is not possible in a feudal or slave economy, as both rest on a broad basis of agriculture, not modern urban industry. Rural economy must give way to capitalist industry before a Socialist economy is possible. *The industry of modern capitalism is the economic framework of a Socialist society.*

It required from a hundred to several hundred years for this framework, the capital structure of industrial society, to be built. By capital structure we mean modern mills, mines, machines, railroads, shipping, telephones, banking institutions, owned by the capitalist class largely in some cor-

porate form. Organized in this form, the capital structure carries within it the cooperative form of production that is essential to a Socialist society. It stands in marked contrast with the petty, scattered and individualist production of all forms of rural economy. *The cooperative type of production is ripe for socialization; small shops, pack-horse transportation, little farms, etc., are not.*

In the rural economy, because of individualist production, the psychology of the masses is individualistic. It is not adapted to a social philosophy. The workers in the mechanic trades, and those who made shoes, clothing, hats, bread, dyes, etc., in the home, had a parochial outlook. More important is the fact that they did not have the machine culture of modern industry, the experience with steam, electricity, tools, division and sub-division of labor, the skill and knowledge of modern industrial organization and processes.

All of these factors are a product of historical evolution. They are the economic, social, and cultural tissues essential to the co-operative production of a Socialist society. They grow slowly over decades, just as the tissues and cells in a human organism do, and as they develop there is a process of change and adjustment to all phases of the evolving organism. A new invention or process, as it comes into use, may have a marked impact upon the machine culture of industry as a whole, and even a new form of transportation or a new industry will register changes in the economic, social, and cultural tissues of society.

HISTORY OF THE CAPITAL STRUCTURE

Now let us consider this industrial framework of society, this capital structure of modern civilization, with its mills, mines, factories, machines, railroads, shipping, telephones, banks, steam, electricity, minute division of labor, technology and general machine culture. Where did this capital

structure come from? It emerged out of the old rural economy and then developed through decades of economic history. It was not planned nor even anticipated by human beings, either by the exploiters or the exploited. It is the sum total of thousands of factors of historical development; but there is one factor in its evolution that is important in Socialist philosophy.

The capital accumulation necessary to the building of this structure of industry was exploited out of the working class. There is no other source of capital accumulation. Whether we like it or not, the capital structure that is essential to a Socialist society must first be built and that capital is derived from labor exploitation.

With this fundamental historical contention goes another one derived from it. Any class that rules in the period between the decay of rural economy and the final stage of capitalist production *must inevitably be an exploiting class*. It is compelled by historical necessity to exploit capital out of the working class, that capital which is necessary to constructing the economic framework of a Socialist society. It does not matter whether this class is known as "captains of industry" or Bolsheviks; in either case, *the historical conditions compel this ruling class to be exploiters of the working class.*

HISTORICAL LAW DICTATES

In economic history what is known as the "industrial revolution" was a process of creating a new class of labor exploiters; this same industrial revolution in Russia is carried on as an "experiment" under the dictatorship of the Bolshevik party. There also is capital accumulation; there also is a class of labor exploiters. The Bolsheviks took power, although a modern capital structure had not appeared in Russia. They have to build it. *To get the capital for it*

they are compelled to exploit it out of the workers. They are compelled to play the same role of labor exploiters which the capitalist class has played in the development of capital.

No amount of explanation can conceal this fundamental fact. Russia is a nation of labor exploiters, just as each capitalist country is. It could not be otherwise. History dictates to the Bolsheviks; they cannot dictate to history. They took power in a period between the decay of rural economy and the final phases of capitalist development and found themselves without the capital structure that is essential to a Socialist order. They then put the whole working class population under a dictatorship and proceeded to exploit the capital out of the workers and peasants. Other ways to obtain the capital would be by foreign loans and concessions, but these also mean labor exploitation.

Both have been tried with little success. Assume that the Bolsheviks had obtained substantial loans from foreign bankers. The principal and interest would have had to be paid out of the values withheld from the workers. Assume that the program of foreign concessions had developed. In that case the Bolsheviks would have simply become partners of foreign exploiters in exploiting Russian workers. *Turn where they will, do what they may, the iron law of history places Bolshevism in the same category with capitalism as a system of labor exploitation.*

SOCIAL vs. INDIVIDUALIST PRODUCTION

We have seen that the capital structure of society is the basis essential to a Socialist society. This structure is *social* production as contrasted with the *individualist* production of the earlier phase of capitalism. Social production can be socialized; individualist production cannot. Petty individu-

alist peasant production, thousands and tens of thousands of small businesses scattered throughout the country, are not adapted to socialization. *Social ownership of an individualist economy is as ridiculous as private ownership of a social economy.*

This philosophy runs through all Socialist literature, even the literature of the Bolsheviks down to their seizure of power in Russia. Both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks agreed that a revolution in Russia, because of the overwhelming predominance of a rural individualist economy and of small scale industry in the urban areas, could produce only a bourgeois democratic republic. The Bolsheviks, however, chose the peasants as middle class allies and the Mensheviks chose the urban middle class as allies. As urban industry carries within it the development of the capital structure essential to Socialism, *the Mensheviks were in accord with Socialist philosophy and the Bolsheviks were not.*

It is from this fundamental conflict of views between Socialism and Bolshevism that all the other conflicts in ideas and methods flow.

This being true, it is necessary further to consider this basic conflict before considering the others that issue out of it. In his chapter on the "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" in the first volume of his "Capital," Marx outlines the development of the capital structure which makes possible a Socialist society. Whether some details of the chapter have been modified or not by later Marxist criticism, its main theme that capitalistic production must reach a high stage of development, that it must be a social form of production, is accepted by all informed Socialists. The same view is presented in the "Communist Manifesto," in the introduction by Marx to his "Critique of Political Economy," and by Engels in his "Socialism from Utopia to Science."

The following from Marx's "Critique" is an excellent short statement of this fundamental principle:

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed; and new and *higher relations of production* never appear before the material conditions of their existence *have matured* in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always takes up *only such problems as it can solve*; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution *already exist* or are at least in the process of formation."

For this reason, Marx and Engels devoted Chapter III of the "Manifesto" to a criticism of various sects which, in 1847, called themselves "Socialist." One sect after another represented the ideology of some group or class not identified with working class interests. Some represented economic interests that cannot be reconciled with Socialism. These sects were limited in their views because of "*total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history.*"

The only sects of that period dealt with more kindly by Marx and Engels are the utopians like St. Simon, Fourier, and Owen, who conceived of the transformation of society through "experiment," an idea revived by the Bolsheviks in the Five Year Plan. Some formed model colonies, while Owen experimented with humane organization of his factories and also with colonies. Marx and Engels also placed Babeuf in the category of utopians, although Babeuf voiced the claims of the working class.

Babeuf was a French forerunner of Bolshevism who in 1796-'97 planned a general uprising under astute leaders. They were to inaugurate a dictatorship of workers to establish "real equality." Marx and Engels pointed out the futility of this because material conditions were not suitable to Socialism. They declared it utopian "*owing to the then un-*

developed state of the proletariat, as well as the absence of the economic conditions that had yet to be produced, and could be produced by the impending bourgeois epoch alone."

BOLSHEVIK UTOPIANS

Both type of utopians, experimenters and early Bolsheviks, were confused. Their confusion corresponded with the undeveloped and confused economic relations of an early stage of capitalism, with the survival of extensive peasant production, of a vast body of petty producers and traders, and with modern industry still in the future. Of the utopians as a whole Marx and Engels wrote:

"Since the development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry, the economic situation, as they find it, *does not as yet offer to them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.* They therefore, *search after a new social science*, after new social laws, that are to create these conditions."

Modern Bolshevism, as we shall see, takes over the idea of proletarian risings (Babeuf), and the idea of "experiment" (Fourier, Owen, etc.). It is true to the utopian pattern. It is no accident that it has its origin and development in Russia, a nation where the building of the capital structure was in its early stage and where agriculture was of a backward type. Bolshevism also prosecutes a "*search after a new social science*" to justify itself. This it calls "Leninism." It is the old utopianism striving to enlist the Marxism which long ago declared it the output of confused minds. *It is not surprising that it has won much approval for its "experiment" and ideology among the bourgeois intellectuals and "liberals" while the support it won among the organized working class of the world in the confusion of the post-war period has been abandoned in practically every modern nation.*

Material economic development is primary. Marxists

never exempted even Socialist groups and parties from it when they began to organize in a low stage of capitalism. In the "Manifesto" already cited, they favored action which varied with the economic development of each country, support of radicals in Switzerland although they were partly bourgeois, of agrarians in Poland "as the prime condition for *national [not proletarian] emancipation*," of the bourgeoisie in Germany "whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the squirearchy, and the petty bourgeoisie."

MARCH BACK TO UTOPIANISM

That is, the survivals of feudal-agricultural conditions must be swept away before a modern capital structure can freely develop and the working class can organize and fight for its own class interests and emancipation. To put it another way, *only a bourgeois revolution is possible under such conditions. The economic conditions for a Socialist order come during or after the reign of a powerful bourgeois class, not before it.* All Marxists and even Lenin, until the Bolsheviks seized power, agreed that Socialism is impossible until the modern capital structure has appeared.

Writing of the trial of the Communists in Cologne in 1852, Marx expressed his contempt for reactionaries who assumed that the party "*imagined itself capable of producing, at any time and at its pleasure, that revolution which was to carry its ideas into practice.*" He added the following significant statement:

"The practical revolutionary experience of 1848-'49 confirmed the reasonings of theory, which led to the conclusion that *the Democracy of the petty traders must first have its turn, before the Communist working class could hope to permanently establish its power and destroy that system of wage slavery which keeps it under the yoke of the bourgeoisie.*"

In the preface to the first volume of "Capital" in 1867, Marx again emphasized this fact by saying that "even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its own movement . . . it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs."

Bolshevism claims that a "bold leap" is possible out of low-scale petty industry and primitive agriculture into Socialism. The "successive phases" of capitalist development are ignored. It substitutes them with legislative enactment and "experiment." Instead of leaping into Socialism, it travels a path back to the old utopianism!

MODERN vs. BACKWARD LEADERSHIP

The utopianism of the Bolsheviks is also registered in the action and methods which they seek to impose upon the Labor and Socialist movement in other countries. They seek to lead the movement in the countries of high-grade capitalism. They reverse the Marxian concept. Marx and Engels regarded the workers in nations of advanced capitalist production as the "advanced sections" of the proletariat, the section that is qualified to lead. This class struggles in nations where the modern capital structure has reached an advanced stage of development.

In drafting the Preamble to the Working Rules of the International Workingmen's Association in 1864—the First International — Marx embodied this historical conception. This he considered essential to prevent the Labor and Socialist movement from falling back into the "old errors" of the early utopians, errors which the Bolsheviks have revived. The following paragraphs are significant:

"That the emancipation of labor is neither a local nor a national but a social problem, which embraces

all countries in which *modern society* exists, and whose solution depends upon the practical and theoretical cooperation of the *most advanced countries*.

"That the present awakening of the working class in the *industrial countries* of Europe gives occasion for new hope, but at the same time contains a solemn warning not to fall back into *old errors*, and demands an immediate union of the movements not yet united."

Thus even in organization and action Marx looked to those countries where the modern capital structure was developing, not to the countries that had not yet entered the cycle of capitalist production or that were in a low stage of this production. Economic development in nations of the first class were favorable to a Socialist movement, but in nations of the second class only a bourgeois revolution was possible. As Werner Sombart wrote, "social ideals are only utopianism so long as they are merely evolved in the head of the theorist. They obtain reality only when they are united to actual economic conditions, when they arise out of these conditions."

UTOPIANISM AND DICTATORSHIP

In 1905, Lenin held that because of economic conditions the coming revolution in Russia must be of a middle class character. In October, 1915, while the World War was being fought, he still held this view, holding that three demands were possible—a democratic republic, confiscation of great estates, and an eight-hour day. Russia remained a country which had not developed a modern capital structure, which had not wiped out its remnants of feudalism, which had not had its bourgeois revolution, and where Socialists, both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, expected no more than a middle class revolution.

After the seizure of power, the Bolsheviks abandoned the

Marxian view that historical conditions limit what can be achieved. They decided to destroy what there was of the bourgeois class, the class whose reign in other countries has been accompanied with the building of the capital structure that is essential to a Socialist society.

They decided to "leap over" this intervening stage of industrial evolution and, like the earlier utopians, to venture upon "experiment." To justify this they invented a new "social science" which they called Leninism. A movement in a backward nation proceeded to dictate to the movements in advanced nations. To carry out this utopianism, the whole working class, both wage workers and peasants, were brought under the iron dictatorship of the Communist Party. Then within the party they created a dictatorship of Lenin and his associates over the party members. Dictatorial power was concentrated into the hands of a few men and was enforced by terror, executions, imprisonment, and exile. Tsar Nicholas was succeeded by Tsar Nicolai! The long and bloody struggle of the working class for economic, social, political, co-operative, and cultural freedom ended in this unexpected perversion of their dreams and ideals.

BOLSHEVIK COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Much is said by the Bolsheviks about "counter-revolution." They effected a counter-revolution against the whole working class of Russia. Socialists of all schools in Russia had for decades fought for liberation from the Tsarist autocracy which represented economic, social, political, and cultural despotism. Socialists of all schools fought and dreamed of liberty and democracy in all phases of life. *For the Tsarist despotism in economic, social, political, and cultural life, the Bolsheviks substituted their own forms of despotism.* If this is not counter-revolution then the word has no meaning.

Once victorious, the Bolshevik dictatorship entered upon the task of creating a Socialist society without a modern capital structure. All forms of economic life were to be socialized, small scale shops, trade, petty industries, banks, etc., and at last agriculture. This continued for nearly four years—to be precise, until July, 1921, when Lenin announced the NEP, the New Economic Policy, a reversal of the policy of socialization. What had happened?

The economic life of Russia was collapsing in ruin. Starvation was rife and the discontent of the masses came to a head in opposition within the party, peasant risings, and the rebellion of the Kronstadt garrison. A Provisional Revolutionary Committee of Soldiers, Sailors, and Workmen ruled Kronstadt for a few days and was crushed with the guns of Trotsky. So the NEP was announced.

What was the NEP? It permitted private trading, the developing of small capitalist enterprise. That is to say, *it invited the building of a capital structure through the normal processes by which it has always been built.* Lenin admitted the failure of the old policy. Of the NEP he said, "we put before ourselves the maximum concessions in order to afford the small producer the most suitable conditions for the display of his energies. The proletarian government, by means of concessions, can bring about an alliance with the capitalist states of the advanced countries, and on that alliance depends the strengthening of our industry, without which we cannot move further along the road to the Communist order."

BOLSHEVIK CONTRADICTION AND FUTILITY

Here Lenin yielded to the principle of historical necessity which requires the private accumulation of capital, the building of the economic structure that is a primary need of a Socialist society. *The Bolsheviks yielded to the possessors of private capital but they did not yield freedom to the work-*

ing class. On the contrary, the dictatorship became more rigid over the masses and the trade unions were made subordinate organs of the dictatorship. The seizure of the peasants' grain was abandoned for a tax on peasant production. Economic conditions began to improve.

The Bolsheviks were the prisoners of inexorable economic law. One cannot follow their policies in detail, but the NEP was not a consistent policy of permitting a capital structure to be built. It became a cat-and-mouse policy in the succeeding years. To the extent that owners of private business became influential the Bolsheviks became scared. They seized and taxed and by various decrees terrorized the small bourgeois class and the "maximum concessions" became uncertain and worthless. *The Bolsheviks wanted a capital structure but feared the bourgeois class which it brought to the front.* Yet without this structure all the grandiose promises of Socialism were utopian dreaming. "Strengthening our industry" was necessary; otherwise "we cannot move along the road to the Communist order," said Lenin. But almost as soon as they began to move along they called a halt because they found the bourgeois class in the line marching with them.

Long ago Marx had told them that "the democracy of the petty traders must first have its turn" before the masses can be emancipated, but the Bolsheviks who terrorized others were in turn terrorized by the logic of the Marxian law of economic history. Political considerations prevented them from facing its logical implications, so they followed a "zig-zag" policy in the NEP period.

INVITING CAPITALIST EXPLOITATION

Because Russia lacked the modern capitalistic means of production and distribution, the Bolsheviks faced the necessity of building it. In the final stages of the NEP they added

to state exploitation of workers and peasants exploitation by capitalists in the form of concessions to foreign investors. These concessions yielded their owners profits of fantastic dimensions.

Granting concessions to foreign exploiters was not a huge success, but at least nineteen were granted. During the years 1925-'26 to 1927-'28 these undertakings yielded an average of 27.1, 53.8, and 85.2 per cent upon the invested capital. One realized 301.9 per cent and another 426.6 per cent! This granting of concessions to alien capitalists was another case of historical conditions dictating to the dictators. It was Bolshevik recognition of the need of building a capital structure, but in yielding to this historical necessity the Bolsheviks consigned the workers in the concession enterprises to intense capitalistic exploitation.

Considering these backgrounds of state and capitalist sweating of surplus value from the working class, all figures of the building of manufacturing plants in Russia have no more significance than the building of such plants in other countries. *The capital embodied in these Russian plants is obtained in the same way that capital is obtained in the capitalist nations—from exploiting labor power.*

The fact that with this extensive exploitation "there is no unemployment in Russia" is also beside the point. There is no unemployment in a prison, but that is no recommendation of prison life. The Russian masses are kept within Russia by a vast espionage and police system so that it is almost impossible to cross the frontier. All of their knowledge of Russia and the rest of the world filters through the Communist press and other agencies of information. What this means may be imagined if the reader had as his only source of information of what happens in the world the "Daily Worker," the organ of the Communist Party in this country.

The bourgeois soul of Bolshevism is obvious in its post-

war history. It has lost its support of the workers in practically all modern countries. It has wooed and won certain sections of the middle class and "liberal intelligentsia." It is no accident that such organs as the *Nation* and the *New Republic* are sentimentally fond of the "experiment," that romantic tourists and pacifists return from Russia stuffed with statistics, *but have no comprehension of the underlying economics of the regime.*

BOLSHEVIK COLLABORATION WITH NAZIS

The bourgeois soul of Bolshevism is also evident in the fact that it hates the proletariat that does not accept its dictatorship just as the capitalist class has always hated the proletariat that fights for its own independent life. Russian Bolshevism made its peace with Hitler when the latter came to power; and previously German Bolshevism had often co-operated with Hitler's Nazis in the German Diets and on important measures in the Reichstag. In April, 1935, *the Soviet rulers signed an agreement with Hitler for a five-year credit of 200 million marks for Soviet purchases of German goods while the world's working class was boycotting Hitler's savage regime.* Russian Bolshevism is also playing the imperialist diplomatic game of the "balance of power" by signing various pacts with the capitalist powers, the latest being an old-style military alliance with France in May, 1935.

Bolshevism considers the movement of the workers not, in the words of Marx and Engels, as "the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority," but as a collection of wooden figures, or conscripts, to be directed by the dictators of the Kremlin. It has sought to bring the workers of all countries under the dictatorship of Stalin through the Communist International.

Issuing out of its basic utopianism is also the manouever

of the "united front." This was a child of deceit and chicanery, as was acknowledged in Lenin's own "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder," and in a pamphlet by the American Communists in 1923. Lenin advised Communists to "*practice trickery, to employ cunning, and to resort to illegal methods—to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth*" in dealing with organizations of workers.

This was followed by the organization of what the Bolsheviks themselves cynically call "innocents' clubs." These consist of sentimental workers and "liberals" of various types together with Communists, who are collected into a group for a "united front." Such fronts have been formed to fight for civil liberties in many countries—always excepting Russia. Other fronts have been formed for "specific issues," such as defense of Tom Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, Negro rights, etc. In all cases, a trusted Communist is wiggled into the office which receives and handles funds. Thus large sums have been obtained that have been diverted to communist purposes.

BOLSHEVISM JUSTIFIES LOW CUNNING

Hundreds of these "innocents' clubs" have been formed in the United States. In the case of Sacco and Vanzetti the club reported to Moscow that it had gathered a half-million dollars for their defense and yet the Boston committee in charge of defense declared it had received no reports from this club, which is still known as the "International Labor Defense." Tom Mooney had a similar experience with a Communist "innocents' club."

Bolshevism plants cells or "nuclei" in the political, cultural, and economic organizations of the working class to capture them. To accomplish this its agents, following Lenin's advice,, sow suspicions among the rank and file, they engage in character assassination and reduce low cunning to

a fine art. They destroy the tissues of human confidence. *The work of the Communist in organizations he seeks to capture does not differ from the work of the spy planted in trade unions by detective agencies.*

In this respect Bolshevism adopts the methods of the Anarchists of the seventies led by Michael Bakunin, who planted secret "nuclei" in the First International. Bakunin, like Stalin, was the supreme law-giver and dictator. He and his trusted colleagues, like the executive of the Communist International, were the "revolutionary staff" for the whole world. Bakunin, like Stalin, was to cultivate the "universal revolution." Bolshevism and Anarchism considered the workers as clay to be shaped to their dictatorial will. Both visioned a despotic regime, *not the self-directed freedom and democracy forecast in all Socialist literature since the days of Marx and Engels.*

Bolsheviks try to identify dictatorship by leaders over the working class with the will of the working class itself. Thus Bukharin in his "Historical Materialism" writes: "The party is not the class; in fact, it may be but a small part of the class, just as the head is but a small part of the body. But it would be absurd to find an opposition between the party and the class." Trotsky in his savage "Dictatorship vs. Democracy" wrote: "The revolutionary supremacy of the proletariat presupposes within the proletariat itself the political supremacy of a party, with a clear program of action and a faultless internal discipline."

Two thousand years ago Menenius Agrippa, spokesman of the Roman oligarchy, compared the various classes in society to the various organs of the human body. The oligarchy of landed proprietors and moneyed men, he explained, constituted the stomach of the social organism. As the hands must feed the stomach in the natural body, so it is the function of the poorer classes in society to produce

wealth and that of the oligarchy to consume it. He inferred that, as the stomach digests food for the benefit of the whole body, so the oligarchy appropriates wealth for the benefit of all social classes. Bukharin has given us a new version of this "social organism" theory. The Communist party is the head, all the rest of the people are the hands, the feet, and so forth. Thy must let the party do their thinking for them—the masses are not capable of thinking for themselves, and must not be permitted to attempt it.

It is the irony of history that these gentlemen have become the victims of the despotism they intended for others! Bukharin and Radek were ousted from official positions and were restored to grace only after humiliating "confessions." Trotsky was expelled and exiled. Ryasanov, head of the Marx-Engels Institute; Tomsky, head of the Trade Unions; Rakovsky, once Ambassador to France; Zinoviev, head of the Communist International; Kamenev, head of the Moscow Soviet; Rykov, Chairman of the Soviet Council—these and many others were ruthlessly punished. The dictatorship has devoured its own children, leaving Stalin undisputed heir to more power than Tsar Nicholas ever had.

SOCIALIST CONFLICT WITH BOLSHEVISM

In 1927 I wrote in my book on "American Communism" that Bolshevism is a special product of Russian history. "Russian economic and bureaucratic history weighs like a mountain upon the minds of Communists. They cannot shake it off. They think in terms of this history, they see the rest of the world through it, and everything else assumes the character, dimensions, coloring, and importance of an experience that is Russian. . . . The variation of climate, geography, language, customs, historical and psychic backgrounds that characterizes each nation does not appear to impress the Communist."

In this sense Bolshevism is a patriotic chauvinism, an insufferable arrogance which assumes that the dictators of the Kremlin have found the final answer to all problems. All who do not accept this answer must be clubbed to their knees. *Stalin is the international law-giver.*

Socialism is in conflict with Bolshevism. They differ in philosophy, historical interpretation, in program, in aim, and in methods. Bolshevism makes a caricature of Socialist philosophy. It has debased every noble ideal of the labor movement. Its philosophy is not that of Marx and Engels. It harks back to the medieval inquisition with its "hodge-podge of sophistic quibblings, groundless distinctions, fanciful allegories." It twists the Marxian interpretation of history when it tries to transform a nation of handicraftsmen, peasants, and nomads into a collective society.

Its aim is also in fundamental conflict with the aim of Socialism. It does not trust the working masses, who are regarded as cattle to be driven, not human beings who are to work out their own problems through self-directed organization, education, and action. Bolshevism establishes itself as a dictatorial clique, and puts the masses under a despotic yoke where it rises to power. It paralyzes their will through fear of imprisonment, exile, or execution. "*Rule or ruin*" is the policy of the dictatorship towards Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries, Anarchists, and dissident Communists, and toward trade unions and co-operative societies.

BOLSHEVIK METHODS

This is not the aim of Socialism, which takes for its ideal a self-governing democracy in all of the institutions of a collective civilization. The Bolsheviks have asserted that they will abandon their dictatorship after they have "built Socialism." They began their iron rule with the promise

that when the civil war was over it would be abandoned. When the White Guard armies had all been defeated, the dictatorship became more ruthless than ever. No reliance can be placed in the promises of the Bolshevik dictatorship or any other dictatorship. *It is a law of dictatorship that power narrows into fewer and fewer hands. No despot ever voluntarily gives up his power.*

If the Labor and Socialist movement is in conflict with Bolshevism in its philosophy, historical interpretation and aim, it is also in deadly conflict with its methods. It makes its dictatorship over the Labor and Socialist movement a fundamental principle. The organizations and members must prostrate themselves before the masters of the Kremlin and accept the orders of Stalin. If the masters order an adventure into conspiracy, or a venture into armed insurrection, or that a program be changed, or that officers be removed, there must be instant obedience.

All organizations must adopt the dogma of "dictatorship of the proletariat," which in practice means dictatorship by a clique of Bolsheviks. Although not openly advocating an armed attack on the governing powers, the Bolsheviks reserve this for their inner circle. In this country in 1919 they again and again called for "armed insurrection" and were driven underground by a nation-wide raid by the Department of Justice. While engaged in this stupidity they took occasion to attack Socialists as "yellow" for not following them. *Their own ranks were filled with spies and stool-pigeons.*

Again and again in Europe and in this country the advocates of conspiracy and armed insurrection have brought their own defeat. In this country the Knights of the Golden Circle in the Civil War, the Anarchists of the eighties with their secret armed organizations of workingmen, and then the Communists in 1919 all reaped the same results. *In*

every instance agents of the government found their way into these organizations and easily became the masters of them.

SOCIALIST vs. BOLSHEVIK AIMS

Dictatorship paralyzes the will of those who come under it, with the exception of a spartan band of heroic men and women who dare death to bring liberation. It makes cowards and sycophants of the courtiers who gather around the dictator. They must despise him, but they grovel before him. The most disgusting thing in Russia are the "confessions" of Bolsheviks who differ with Stalin, the admission of "errors," the servile promises to follow his "line."

Bolshevism is a degenerate perversion of the Labor and Socialist movement. Our opposition to it differs fundamentally from the opposition of the capitalist world. The world of capitalism has made its peace with Bolshevik Russia, but it may again turn to a policy of intervention. *To capitalist intervention in Russia all Socialists are opposed. It would not lead to the liberation of the masses from the dictatorship. It would more likely establish a reactionary regime supported by European bayonets.*

The liberation of the Russian masses from the Bolshevik dictatorship is the task of the masses themselves. Underground propaganda for this purpose is carried on by workers under extraordinary difficulties. The dictatorship at times also reveals internal crises. Opposition after opposition is ruthlessly crushed, the latest one with a "bloody purge," and yet new dissent follows each internal party crisis. The Bolshevik machinery of repression is the most extraordinary that has ever been organized, far exceeding in efficiency that of the old Tsarism, and yet there are those who risk exile and death to strike off the fetters that hold the masses in chains.

Socialism seeks a democratic transformation of society,

not a reversion to the absolutist regimes of the past. It seeks to permeate the masses with the knowledge and the will to acquire power and to transform the economic, social, cultural, and governing institutions into a collective society where the freely formed and freely expressed collective will is the source of decisions.

Socialists do not regard the masses as robots to be placed under the yoke of dictators. Once power is acquired to transform our highly organized industrial civilization into a Socialist commonwealth, the collective regime will know how to defend itself against reactionary conspiracy, but in effecting this defense it will not place the masses in a strait-jacket nor bring a civil war in the ranks of the masses themselves.

The American Judiciary Is On Trial

Are we governed by laws or by judges?
Do judges interpret the law without fear or favor?
Are they accessible to back-door influence?
At best, are they not influenced by class prejudice?

LAWLESS JUDGES

By

LOUIS P. GOLDBERG and ELEANORE LEVENSON

will answer such questions as these by citing case after case to illustrate how Judges bend and break the laws to favor Capital as against Labor.

TO APPEAR ON OCTOBER 15

Cloth bound, ca. 300 pp.

Price, \$2.50

The Rand School Press

7 East 15th Street

New York

BOOKSELLERS

PUBLISHERS

THE RAND BOOK STORE

7 East 15th Street, New York

We specialize on Socialism, Labor, and related subjects, but we do a general book business, and can provide any book in print. On our own publications we give liberal discounts on quantity orders. Here are a few of them:-

LOOSE LEAVES FROM A BUSY LIFE	\$2.50
<i>By Morris Hillquit</i>	
FARMER AND LABOR PARTIES IN THE U. S.	\$2.00
<i>By Nathan Fine</i>	(Formerly \$3.00)
AMERICAN COMMUNISM	\$1.00
<i>By James Oneal</i>	(Formerly \$1.50)
THE WORKERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY	50c
<i>By James Oneal</i>	
THE REBEL SONG BOOK	50c
Ninety-two pages of words and music.	
A MANUAL FOR SOCIALIST SPEAKERS	25c
<i>By August Claessens</i>	

Pamphlets to Sell at Public Meetings:

SHOULD THE WORKERS FORM A PARTY OF THEIR OWN?	
<i>Debate between Morris Hillquit and Matthew Woll</i>	
Ten cents a copy; 25 for \$1.50	
ESSENTIALS OF SOCIALISM	
<i>By August Claessens</i>	
Five cents a copy; 25 for 75 cents	
A WORKERS' WORLD	
<i>By David P. Berenberg</i>	
Five cents a copy; 25 for 75 cents	

The Rand Book Store

7 East 15th Street

New York City

THE RAND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Begins its thirtieth year of Labor and Socialist education in October, 1935. For eight or nine months each year it conducts about forty classes a week in History, Sociology, Economics, Social and Labor Questions, Socialism and Trade Unionism; in English, Public Speaking, and Parliamentary Law; and also in Philosophy, Psychology, and Literature.

Many hundreds of former Rand School students are now active in Labor and Socialist organizations all over the country.

If you live too far from New York City to attend Rand School classes, write for a circular describing our Correspondence Courses—

- I. INTRODUCTION TO SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM
- II. TRADE UNIONISM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Especially in the smaller cities and towns Rand School Correspondence Classes are an invaluable aid to the Party and the Unions.

Rand School of Social Science
7 East 15th Street
New York

THE NEW LEADER

AMERICA'S LEADING SOCIALIST WEEKLY

The New Leader is indispensable to everyone who wishes to keep abreast of the times.

No other periodical so fully and in so interesting a way covers American International Developments in the field of Socialist and Labor thought and action or so correctly and clearly interprets the Industrial and Political News of the Week.

Subscription price (outside New York City) \$1.00 a year; 50 cents for six months;—in New York, \$2.00 and \$1.00 respectively.

The New Leader

7 East 15th Street
New York